

# **Core Strategy Further Consultation Report October 2008**

*Report of Consultation*

Published December 2009

## **Introduction**

Charnwood Borough Council is preparing a Core Strategy development plan document as part of its Local Development Framework. Once adopted, this document will provide the vision and strategic planning policy framework for Charnwood guiding the future development of the Borough until 2026.

A series of other planning documents detailed in the Council's Local Development Scheme will follow on from the Core Strategy and will be prepared in general conformity with its policies.

Work on the Core Strategy commenced in early 2004 and since then the Council has undertaken a series of consultation events with local communities and other stakeholders:

- Towards a Charnwood Local Development Framework - Issues & Questions (May 2004)
- Issues and Options (June 2005)
- Planning for Our Next Generation – Preferred Options Report (February 2006)
- Planning for Our Next Generation – Alternative Strategies (September 2007)
- Key Stakeholder topic based workshops (July-August 2008)

The comments made during this consultation<sup>1</sup> have been used to inform the Core Strategy Further Consultation Report, which was published for six weeks of consultation between 24<sup>th</sup> October 2008 and 5<sup>th</sup> December 2008.

### ***How did we consult you?***

To publicise the launch of the Core Strategy Further Consultation Report the Council:

- Sent a postcard to every household in the Borough explaining the consultation and detailing when and where consultation events were taking place;
- Sent a letter to the people registered on the Council's LDF database informing them of the publication of the further consultation report and how they could get involved;
- Sent email alerts to the 212 people registered to receive alerts via the Charnwood 2026 Email Alert service;<sup>2</sup>
- Issued formal press notices in the Leicester Mercury (Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2008) and the Loughborough Echo (Friday 17<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> October 2008);
- Issued 4 press releases announcing the launch (and responded to subsequent press queries) on the following dates:
  - 19<sup>th</sup> September 2008 – pre-cursor to launch of consultation
  - 21<sup>st</sup> October 2008 – Launch of Core Strategy Further Consultation report
  - 18<sup>th</sup> November – Feedback on the public meetings and other events
  - 4<sup>th</sup> February 2009 – Responses received now available on the website

---

<sup>1</sup> Available from the Council's website at: <http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/corestrategydpd>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/ldfsignup>

- An article was issued in the Winter 2008 edition of Charnwood News - the Council's newsletter which is sent to every household in the borough;
- Posters advertising the events were placed in the Council offices and around the Borough at Libraries and sent to Parish and Town Council's for wider distribution;

The Council also held a series of events around the Borough during the consultation period to explain the Further Consultation Report and to enable people to ask questions. These events are set out below:

<b>Road shows &amp; Exhibitions</b>				
<b>Date</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Type</b>
Fri 24 <sup>th</sup> October	Sileby	Community Centre, High Street	1pm-5pm	Exhibition
Sat 25 <sup>th</sup> October	Syston	Community Centre, School Street	10am - 2pm	Exhibition
Mon 27 <sup>th</sup> October	Anstey	Jubilee Hall, Staddon Road	7pm – 9pm	Exhibition
Tues 28 <sup>th</sup> October	Rearsby	Horse & Groom PH, Melton Road	10am - 2pm	Exhibition
Thu 30 <sup>th</sup> October	Loughborough	Maxwell Drive Community Centre	10am - 2pm	Exhibition
Thu 30 <sup>th</sup> October	Woodhouse Eaves	Village Hall Annexe, Main Street	7pm – 9pm	Exhibition
Sat 1 <sup>st</sup> November	Loughborough	The Rushes, Unit corner of Biggin Street	10am-4pm	Exhibition
Mon 3 <sup>rd</sup> November	Quorn	Quorn Village Hall, 64 Leicester Road	10am - 2pm	Exhibition
Tues 4 <sup>th</sup> November	Barrow upon Soar	Parish Offices, High Street	10am - 2pm	Exhibition
Wed 5 <sup>th</sup> November	Thurmaston	Mobile Exhibition, Asda store car park, Barkby Thorpe Lane	10am-6pm	Exhibition inside a caravan
Thu 6 <sup>th</sup> November	Shepshed	Mobile Exhibition, Shepshed Library car park, Hall Croft	10am-6pm	Exhibition inside a caravan
Fri 7 <sup>th</sup> November	Loughborough	Mobile Exhibition Tesco store car park, Park Road	10am-6pm	Exhibition inside a caravan
Fri 7 <sup>th</sup> November	Mountsorrel	Memorial Hall, 105 Leicester Road	7pm – 9pm	Exhibition
Tues 11 <sup>th</sup> November	Wymeswold	Memorial Hall, Clay Street	7pm – 9pm	Exhibition
Wed 12 <sup>th</sup> November	Birstall	Village Hall, School Lane	7pm – 9pm	Exhibition

<b>Presentation &amp; Discussion Forums</b>			
<b>Date</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Time</b>
Tues 28 <sup>th</sup> October	Loughborough	Town Hall,- Victoria Room	7pm – 9pm
Wed 29 <sup>th</sup> October	Thurmaston	Eliz Park Sports	7pm – 9pm
Fri 31 <sup>st</sup> October	Shepshed	Glenmore centre	7pm – 9pm
Tues 4 <sup>th</sup> November	Syston	Community Centre, School Street Brookside Suite	7pm – 9pm
Mon 10 <sup>th</sup> November	Hathern	Hathern Community Centre, Pasture Lane	7pm – 9pm

In addition to these meetings the Council provided a workshop for the Charnwood Youth Forum on 15<sup>th</sup> October 2008 at Loughborough Town Hall and gave presentations to round four of the Charnwood Area Forums. These seven Area Forums were held on the following dates:

- Loughborough South West Area Forum 1<sup>st</sup> October 2008
- Loughborough East Area Forum 9<sup>th</sup> October 2008
- Loughborough North West Area Forum 13<sup>th</sup> October 2008
- Bradgate, Rothley & Birstall Area Forum 29<sup>th</sup> October 2008
- Quorn Barrow, Sileby and the Wolds Area Forum 12<sup>th</sup> November 2008
- Shepshed, Hathern & Dishley Area Forum 27<sup>th</sup> November 2008
- South Charnwood Area Forum 13<sup>th</sup> November 2008

Finally, in advance of the launch of the Core Strategy Further Consultation Report a series of four online customer polls were held via the website. The polls provided an opportunity to promote the use of the online consultation tool to the public and to gather views on consultation.

<b>Poll</b>	<b>Start date</b>	<b>End date</b>	<b>Responses</b>
Limehouse Launch poll	24 July 2008	15 August 2008	22
Consultation awareness poll	15 August 2008	29 August 2008	83
Find out about consultation poll	29 August 2008	16 September 2008	61
Post Limehouse Launch poll	19 September 2008	3 October 2008	34

The results of the polls are set out in Appendix A.

### ***What did we receive from you?***

The response to the Core Strategy Further Consultation Report has been considerable and the Council has received a large amount of comments to date through the various channels of consultation.

Around 1,550 people attended the road shows, exhibitions and discussion forums. A small number of comments were made in writing at the events themselves but most were made verbally. Comments were recorded where possible and the key issues summarised for each event. The Area Forum meetings were formal meetings and the comments made were recorded by the administration for each Area Forum. The key issues from the events are available to view or download from our website at:

[http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/core\\_strategy\\_further\\_consultation\\_events](http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy_further_consultation_events)

In addition to the comments made at road shows, exhibitions and discussion forums, responses to the Core Strategy consultation document itself were submitted to the Council either by email, letter or using the Council's online consultation tool. Although, the advertised consultation period extended between 24<sup>th</sup> October to 5<sup>th</sup> December 2008, comments continue to be submitted and by the end of December 2009, 1,535 people had responded making 3,609 comments.

The questions in the consultation document that received by far the greatest response were the preferred locations for future directions for growth with over 790 responses received to West Loughborough option and 316 responses to East Thurmaston/North of Hamilton option. In addition, a respondent promoting a sustainable urban extension within the direction for growth to South West Loughborough generated a strong response from the public with 417 further

responses being received. In total 596 proforma letters were received by the Council making comments on the directions for growth, approach to the settlement hierarchy, regeneration and gypsies, travellers and showpeople.

### ***How have we dealt with your written comments?***

The Council has scanned all of the written comments made by respondents and these are available on the website at: [http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/further\\_consultation\\_representations](http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/further_consultation_representations)

All the comments have been read and attributed to the questions raised in the Further Consultation Report. Most of the comments submitted directly relate to specific questions raised in the consultation document but others include responses to a number of questions. Where the latter is the case the response has been uploaded to the online consultation tool and copied across to each relevant question so that a summary of each can be made. A number of responses were general in nature or did not identify a specific question and for these officers have matched the responses to specific consultation questions in order to assist in the analysis of comments made. The comments can be accessed through the consultation tool by following this link: <http://consult.charnwood.gov.uk/portal>

A significant number of the responses received arose from 'round-robin' letters. These are letters that have been produced once, copied, circulated around local communities and then individually submitted to the Council. These letters have been grouped together, summarised once by officers and then copied to each of the respondents in turn. Some of the individual round robin responses contain additional information over and above the information contained in the original letter. These specific points are recorded as representations unique to individual respondents.

### ***Customer feedback from the presentations and discussion forums***

The key issues arising from discussion at the events have been published separately and are available on the website from this link: [http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/core\\_strategy\\_further\\_consultation\\_events](http://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/core_strategy_further_consultation_events)

## **Event Evaluation Forms**

An 'event evaluation form' was circulated to everyone who attended a presentation and discussion forum in order to gather views about the events and to help officers improve public consultation in the future. A summary of the comments about the events follows. Please note that comments have been edited to remove offensive statements.

### ***Loughborough Town Hall 28<sup>th</sup> October 2008***

64 people attended this event and 23 event evaluation forms were received. Of the 23 respondents 17 thought the event was either very useful or quite useful with 4 saying it was not useful at all. 14 respondents thought the content of event was appropriate although 6 did not agree. 18 respondents felt the event was suitable and an appropriate length. 11 of the respondents felt the presenters fully answered the questions raised although 5 did not and a further five were unsure. Most respondents heard about the event via the postcard.

#### What did you find most useful?

- Gaining perspective of other contributors priorities and issues
- Access to the thinking by the planners

- It was useful to hear a lot of divergent views on development opportunities
- Gauging public opinion by listening to questions, views, etc
- To find out more information and to have an opportunity to ask questions and hear answers even if the answers were complex and jargon filled at times. Everyone in audience who wished to speak was given the opportunity.
- The workshop session provided a chance to get the views of others, not just the Council and was a useful insight into planning.
- Good brochure and discussion aids, to consider the issues involved. .
- Chance to hear other people's views and questions. The initial exercise which looked at factors to consider in making the plans!
- Good leaflet handout.
- Nothing - we are not budding planners and wanted to know the pros and cons of proposed sites and why.
- Explaining the challenges that face planners. Getting participants to look beyond self centred interests
- The presenter was inaudible from table 4. Various persons were invited to speak without others knowing who they were.

#### What did you least useful?

- The workshop - this seemed of limited actual use.
- The workshop and discussion groups - because of seating arrangement / several groups discussing in same room - almost impossible to hear what was being said
- Opening workshop was much too long! Most important factor missing - creating a pleasant environment to live in!
- Lack of willingness to discuss new road building
- Seemed more like a fait accompli rather than a real consultation. Not enough detail about the options discarded or the settlement hierarchy
- Director reading out to the audience what was on the screen
- That to question need for 19,000 more homes was off topic and that CBC officials are not willing to make more effort to resist such imposition.
- Got more information from Loughborough Echo article
- On screen presentation added little to the info already presented in brochure. Screen not easy to view - too high up and small.
- Table discussion difficult due to very poor acoustics, wrong shape of table and group too large.
- A few ill-informed questions. E.g. (1) confusing Loughborough and Charnwood, (2) deliberately ignoring the point that there are three main drivers of population growth in order to concentrate on attacking foreign immigration
- Poor sound - PA equipment
- Seating arrangements not suitable for group discussion. Tables of 4 could have been better. It is impossible to have a discussion sitting in a row. Too long for group discussion.
- The initial discussion on planning themes
- Not being a novice to planning issues, this event was not going to get to the detail and my exercise class was more useful way to spend my time!
- Symbolic, people not understanding what was expected of them.

#### Was there anything else that was not included that you would have liked to have been?

- More on the merits of alternative sites for development.
- More information about Council activities to encourage inward investment, other than Science Park
- Town Centre Plan

- More on industrial development, road and transport constraints
- More information on roads needed to support building development - in particular the bypass - this does need to be brought out into the open and properly discussed.
- More team dialogue
- Efforts by the Council to resist the unwanted imposition of 19,000 mores located next to already congested Loughborough.
- I expected much more detail
- Needed opportunity to compare different potential development options
- Too much concentration on preferred option, very little information about other options.
- A summary of information to show how two preferred sites were selected
- How to tier participants to the evening, left at 8pm

### ***Thurmaston – Elizabeth Park Sports Centre 29<sup>th</sup> October 2008***

70 people attended this event and 9 event evaluation forms were received. 6 respondents found the event either very useful or useful with only 1 respondent stating the event was not useful at all. 5 thought the content of the event was appropriate although 3 did not. All respondents thought the venue was appropriate for the event with 7 stating that the length of the event was about right and 2 saying it was too long. 4 respondents felt that questions were fully answered although 4 respondents did not or were not sure. The postcard and leaflet proved the most popular form of advertising for the event.

#### What did you find most useful?

- Raising awareness of proposals;
- I know realise that the idea for Thurmaston is ridiculous, Charnwood have given no thought for Thurmaston an Barkby, they are only interested in maintaining the identity of other villages, as long as it's not on their doorstep they are not bothered;
- That the questions were answered and reason's given honestly;
- Good way to get people to talk and air their views whether good or bad;
- This confirmed to me that Councils tow the line and do not challenge Government. Whenever has this Government got any numbers correct in terms of predictions. Democracy is a joke. More Spin!
- It gave the people of Thurmaston an opportunity to air their views in opposition to the scheme and to hear the numerous reasons why Thurmaston should not be expanded;
- A means of judging levels of similar minded villagers and confirming strength of feelings!!!!

#### What did you find least useful

- Not enough details;
- Some key factors missing in discussion prompts;
- Council have decided this is what is going to happen and feel they meeting was to appease Thurmaston residents, our feelings do not matter. We have enough problems with transport etc. Hamilton still have no facilities;
- It seems to be a done deal, Thurmaston does not need doubling in size;
- That no answer's could really be given on how employment will be brought to the development and what sorts of wages and jobs available to help people to pay for the houses especially as the area have lost jobs (decent ones) hard over fist;
- No comments at this time can be aware on types of housing and industry we have to be very careful not to cause social problems with in appropriate housing as this has been done before;
- Had to leave would have preferred this to be the opening slot. This was the most important to me;

- The 1st session group work. I do not need other people about what is important - I have a brain of my own. We are treated like school children;
- Workshop element of evening;
- That the proposed scheme was very shallow, especially when it came to actually knowing where the precise area of development would be and answers that couldn't be given regarding road structures, industrial developments and access to the major road systems;
- Chart formations that counted for nothing on the night. The results can be "advised" when out of the public eye!

Was there anything else that was not included that you would have liked to have been?

- More detail about the plans eg. a copy of the plan for us to look at;
- I thought the meeting was for our views. Seems it was just to let us know it is happening. It is indicated new industry will give more jobs to the area, do the Industry Companies know they are expected to employ local people, or are we going to have more traffic with more people coming to work in the area;
- Very wishy washy - no nuts & bolts. Basically we can close our eyes here and now and we may as well be in Fosse Park!
- Thurmaston is already the highest payers of council tax in the Borough, with very few facilities. Another 5000 houses would be very welcome to you as a council, with more council tax payable, but with still fewer facilities;
- A way of recording actual numbers and feelings. Not everyone will complete the forms having left the meeting! Good Ploy!

### **Shepshed – Glenmore Centre 31<sup>st</sup> October 2008**

74 people attended this event and 8 evaluation forms were received. 4 respondents thought the event was either very useful or quite useful with 3 considering the event to not be useful at all. 5 out of 8 respondents thought the content of the event was appropriate. All respondents were satisfied with the suitability of the venue although 3 thought it went on for too long. 6 of the 8 respondents felt that questions were fully answered. The postcard and leaflet were the main way that attendees heard about the event although 2 heard about it from the Garendon Park Protection Group.

What did you find most useful?

- None;
- That it was already a done deal and they were only ticking boxes to suit themselves;
- This was a 2 hour meeting with only 20 mins devoted to questions and answers. This is not sufficient, the workshop could have been much shorter by simply asking groups to spend less time simply listing their concerns and then opening this up to Q&A and discussion;
- Find out what the possible future holds and how it affects the population/area of Shepshed;
- Finding out the issues facing the planning dept, why certain decisions are being considered and made. I also found useful, what governs a planning decision, traffic, housing, roads, countryside etc;
- All of it;

### What did you find least useful

- There is no time to ask any questions - 7pm start, 8.45 questions, 5 mins per answer;
- Just to confirm as before;
- Everything;
- The time wasting;
- Lot of time wasting questions!
- Daft questions from the audience, but we live in a democracy, thankfully!
- You are not listening;
- Council negative about brown site's ie. Wymeswold and about any other sites in the area

### Was there anything else that was not included that you would have liked to have been?

- More time to ask and discuss we only had time to listen;
- A waste of time! If you actually listened and not talk!!!
- Some truth on the agenda that is being tabled as when a developer wants to build at Cotes why is this not being considered better and that the County wish to build an Eastern Bypass which they could do quite easily;
- Consideration must be given not only to new housing/shops etc but planning depts must give due thought to applications to build new places of worship;
- It would have been good to discuss other major planning applications pending in Shepshed, but as said, they are separate issues;
- No;

### **Syston – Syston Community Centre 4<sup>th</sup> November 2008**

20 people attended this event and 9 event evaluation forms were received. 4 respondents felt the event was either very useful or quite useful although 3 did not think the event was useful at all. 4 out of 9 respondents felt the content of the event was appropriate. All 9 respondents considered that the event venue was suitable. Those that felt the length of the event was just right was balanced equally by those that felt it was too long. 4 respondents felt the audience's questions were not fully answered compared with 3 who did. The leaflet was the main medium people heard about the event.

### What did you find most useful?

- We were shown an obviously decided area in 7a, 7b, 7c (which horrified us) for all required housing;
- That we discovered that the plan was not yet developed enough to make useful comments (eg no decision about roads for scheme 7. But schemes 8/9 had been rejected, on grounds of the infrastructure not sufficient!!!
- Listening to others views and the general overview;
- Review of all the potential sites and the reasoning behind the selection of the two preferred sites;
- To hear the views from other members of the audience;

### What did you find least useful

- Not enough reasons were given to explain why this was to be the only area. Overall reasons were given for assessment but no specifics;
- The only comments that could really be made as no evidence offered was not in my backyard!!
- Too long for what we learned;

- No information was available regarding transport links and road infrastructure for the Thurmaston site;
- I felt the decision had already been made;
- The stars;
- The workshop session

Was there anything else that was not included that you would have liked to have been?

- Much more developed scheme for what already seems to be a chosen site. No real choice offered;
- It is a massive development - there was not much discussion about adopting 3 or 4 medium scale developments, which I believe is more suitable;
- Where I might farm when I get older;
- Road infrastructure;
- Where will our cows graze? Where would we keep our bales? Need I go on?

### ***Hathern – Hathern Community Centre 10<sup>th</sup> November 2008***

160 people attended this event and 27 evaluation forms were received. 14 respondents felt the event was either very useful or quite useful with 4 respondents considering it was not useful at all. 15 respondents thought the content was appropriate although 11 did not. 22 respondents thought the event was suitable but only 14 felt the event was of the appropriate length – 4 respondents considered that the event was too short and 4 too long. 8 respondents felt that the questions were fully answered but 17 did not. The leaflet and the postcard were the most cited means by which people heard about the event (13 and 12 responses respectively).

What did you find most useful?

- Hearing views of other villagers;
- Hearing the issues raised by villagers and the lack of 'known' information by the Officers. Knowing that the decision has already been made! The Shepshed/Hathern site;
- We were given an opportunity to air our opinions - the feeling of the meeting against this proposal is very strong;
- The amount of people at the meeting oppose to it;
- All public views were the same especially emphasising that people choose to live in a village & preserve their identity & not be part of an urban sprawl;
- Understanding of development & its impact on Borough;
- The opportunity to speak, & to hear opinions & information from people who have lived in Hathern longer than I have. Local knowledge & history should not be underestimated! The huge turnout alone shows the wonderful community spirit in the village;
- First 15 minutes speech where complete waffle; Next 15 minutes wasted reading out a hand out;
- The presentations on the alternatives that have been considered. The patience of the Planning Staff;
- How many questions are still around involving the detail? The whole presentation was far too vague. Disgusted that there were no Councillors in attendance. Public consultation has not been consistent or to the same level in other sites;
- The meeting in its presentation clearly indicated that the proposal of development in the Garendon area will happen whatever the consultation may bring up. Consequently as a consultation it was worthless;
- Change to argue about plans;
- The pro's and con's of the sites. The basic size of the sites.

- A scheduled 2 hours was adequate. We appreciated the fact the presenters over ran so everyone who wanted to speak had an opportunity;
- Learning the pros and cons of the various sites under consideration;
- Learning more about the other sites considered with respect to Hathern/Shepshed. Questions were answered as far as they were able with the information to hand;
- Finding out that this was the preferred option. Although some facts were not available due to "reps" not "knowing";
- The event told me very little!
- Confirmed my opinion that planners will make the solution fit the political demand despite the common sense opposition from residents - so much for democracy!
- Made us realise what a fight we have to face from councillors and planners who have already made up their minds which development they wish to go ahead with;
- That my thoughts were confirmed and that was - Not enough information - FACTS - FIGURES were available OR believable and that a lot of pulling wool over the eyes would be tried;

#### What did you find least useful

- Planning officers presented facts to support their arguments, but were very vague when answering questions;
- The lack of information eg transport to the proposed site;
- Lack of detail of the proposal; Many questions were left unanswered; Consultation of this type needs a deeper level of detail so that judgements can be made;
- This was not a consultation; Members not in full awareness of the basic facts; Cabinet members not in attendance at the meeting; The proposal was a 'fait accomplie' - an exercise in political correctness ie we want your opinions but we've already decided that this (Hathern) is going to be the chosen site - But we have to ask your opinion anyway, to make it legal;
- Needed somewhere larger to accommodate numbers;
- Not long enough;
- The fact that not enough detail was available of traffic effects on Hathern. No Cabinet members were available. No Director of planning. As usual Hathern is last to have a meeting. (last time we were almost forgotten altogether);
- Too small;
- Presenters were unprepared and at time patronising; sounded like the development was a foregone conclusion already;
- Officers were ill-prepared and quoted reports not available. They did not know their facts. The Head of Planning did not lead a 'meaningful' discussion. Felt as though our comments fell on deaf ears - and that the development was a foregone conclusion;
- Not enough details;
- Transport details not available in relation to extra traffic on the A6;
- Totally closed minds, decision has already been made;
- Lack of information available to help people know exactly what you are planning;
- Complete lack of detail around traffic congestion, impact on surrounding areas other options not considered;
- Cabinet members not in attendance. No consideration of traffic or effect on village. The reasons for rejecting other sites all apply to Hathern;
- Lack of specifics can't comment on vague proposals. Attitude of presenter condescending
- The planning staff could only give information this is a political issue too, those who will make the decision should be there!! A disgrace;
- A) Apologising for, eg. an exercise you were going to do, but abandon because of the size of the audience, was unhelpful. This may have resulted in the high degree of audience response being like a bad soap opera. B) W.R.T. the timing of exhibitions and discussion evenings as a whole. It was most unhelpful having discussion evenings scheduled to occur before the

exhibitions - this made it difficult to have an informed discussion. Also it would have been useful to know well in advance about the lengthy consultation document, available in the library; again this would have enabled a more informed discussion and questions and answer session. C) The presenters seemed to contradict themselves a number of times. D) starting with an empathic opening might have reduced audience hostility and disrespectful behaviour and this might have resulted in the evening being more useful and informative.

- The absence of the Councillors and the Director. The Chairman of the meeting seemed uncomfortable with the tone of the meeting;
- The Council appeared not to have done its homework. They should 1) have anticipated the numbers likely to attend due to the local interest and 2) been better briefed on the questions that might have been anticipated;
- Although rather noisy and difficult to hear;
- The "listen to me, I'm the expert, your opinions don't count" attitude. Why do we try to make democracy work with pre-programmed presents like this?
- There were no councillors present at this meeting so every time a difficult point was raised the buck was passed to them - so no question properly answered
- Shuffling through papers, in an effort to find answers to questions asked and the lack of being able to answer questions, which amounted to lack of knowledge from the presenters;

Was there anything else that was not included that you would have liked to have been?

- Facts & figures;
- Full Charnwood 2026 Plan (Brochure);
- Borough Councillors & Cabinet being present so that we could make our feelings known to them - as at the other meetings - totally unfair!
- Transport projection figures; Convincing reasons why other sites are not viable; Comparative figures & statistics of other (rejected sites);
- Effect on our village from surface water & effect of Black Brook, plus details of industrial estate;
- The presenter quoted reports and "facts", but could not back them up with firm statistics;
- Informed stats;
- The traffic issue of the A6 is the main issue for any settlement in or around Loughborough & there was not enough information available on the impact - no statistics; Information on the timeline of the whole project;
- No integrated transport plan - no integration with road transport;
- More detailed description of the locations of the alternative site;
- More detail! The decision has already been made!!
- A REAL consultation rather than a justification on the planners decision;
- How planners have supposedly 'had to' decide to opt for 'Urban Concentration' many object to this where was the Consultation on other schemes;
- The planning staff could only give information this is a political issue too, those who will make the decision should be there!! A disgrace;
- It would have been helpful if the speakers had had more detailed facts;
- The absence of the Councillor's from the meeting was unfortunate and might have been foreseen when arranging the event.
- The event was informative and generally well presented on the whole. However there were a number of questions which could not be answered sufficiently, plus the absence of any Councillors left me feeling they knew what kind of reception your plan was going to receive so they sent in other Council employees to take the flak;
- The impact that the proposed airport, extra runway and the M1 widening would also have and NWL planning for Long Whatton;
- For more 'basic' information;

- Yes - serious discussion on the prior EXCLUDED OPTIONS - JUSTIFICATION (not just out of date projected political numbers) for the development;
- No discussion about other possible sites themselves of Council should have been present to answer for their decisions;
- Far more facts, figures and analysis of surveys which should have been undertaken;

## APPENDIX A - CUSTOMER ONLINE POLLS

Please note the number of responses does not necessarily equate to the number of respondents who took part.

### Limehouse Launch poll

22 people took part in this poll raising 49 responses

<b>What types of consultation do you think are the most effective?</b>		
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>percentage</b>
Public meetings	12	24.5
Exhibitions and road shows	8	16.3
Leaflets & posters in community buildings	2	4.1
Focus groups & forums	9	18.4
Officers attending Parish Council/Area Forum Meetings	8	16.3
Online consultation	10	20.4
<b>total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100</b>

### Consultation awareness poll

83 people took part in this poll but only 80 responses are recorded

<b>How would you prefer to be told about a forthcoming consultation event?</b>		
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>percentage</b>
Postcards	0	0
Email alert	74	92.6
SMS text message	0	0
Letter	6	7.6
Posters and leaflets in community buildings	0	0
<b>total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>

### Find out about consultation poll

61 people took part in this poll but only 46 responses are recorded

<b>We will launch a further consultation on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2008. How would you prefer to find out more about the consultation?</b>		
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>percentage</b>
By reading the documents on the website	46	53.5
From a friend	1	1.2
From my local councillor	1	1.2
By attending one of the meetings	7	8.1

organised in my community		
By attending one of the exhibitions in the Borough	5	5.8
A combination of ways	19	22.1
By attending an area forum	7	8.1
<b>total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100</b>

Post Limehouse Launch poll

34 people took part in the poll and recorded 46 responses

<b>Tell us when you prefer meetings and events to be held during a six week consultation period?</b>		
	<b>Responses</b>	<b>percentage</b>
In the first two weeks of the consultation period	4	12.9
In the first four weeks of the consultation period	15	48.4
Spread evenly throughout the consultation period	12	38.7
<b>total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100</b>

## APPENDIX B – CONSULTATION STATISTICS

Consultation Point	Comment	Support	Object	Proforma Letters (Objection)	Totals
Core Strategy – General Comments	12				12
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>					
Introduction	5	3	8		16
<b>Chapter 2: Context</b>					
Spatial Portrait for Charnwood	6	1	1		8
The Strategic Context		2	1		3
The Sustainable Community Strategy		2			2
The Three Cities New Growth Point	2				2
<b>Chapter 3: A Spatial Strategy for Charnwood</b>					
A Spatial Strategy for Charnwood – General Comments		1			1
What are the Issues?	9	5			14
Our Vision	14	2	3		19
Spatial Objectives	17	4	1		22
<b>Chapter 4: Development Strategy for Charnwood</b>					
<b>Introduction</b>					
Overall Principles and Priorities	7	3	6		16
<b>Settlement Hierarchy</b>					
Question 4.1	4	13	12	54	83
Do you agree that Shepshed should be considered as part of the Loughborough Sub-Regional Centre?					
Question 4.2	18			377	395
Which settlement do you live in and what sort of place would you like it to be in twenty years time?					
Question 4.3	3	8	5		16
Any Other Comments?					
<b>Location of New Development</b>					
Question 4.4	3	12	16		31
Do you agree that housing development in Other Settlements should be restricted to affordable housing to meet an identified local need?					
Question 4.5	2	10	9		21
Do you agree that the settlement limits should be removed from all Small Villages and Hamlets?					
Question 4.6	2	3	13		18
Do you think the settlement limits should be removed for the Other Settlements as well as for Small Villages and Hamlets? (This would restrict future development to affordable housing only).					
Question 4.7	1	24	4		29
Do you agree that further development in Service Centres could help to address local issues or improve service provision?					
Question 4.8	9	11	12		32
Any Other Comments?					

## Directions for Growth

Question 4.9 Do you agree with identifying sustainable urban extensions rather than a large number of smaller extensions to urban areas?	4	35	30	69	
Question 4.10 Do you agree that future growth of Loughborough and Shepshed should be focused west of Loughborough/north of Garendon Park?	9	31	154	596	790
Question 4.11 Do you agree that future growth of Leicester should be focused east of Thurmaston and north of Hamilton?	11	22	283	316	
Question 4.12 Any Other Comments?	14	6	7	27	

## Employment Provision

Question 4.13 Do you agree that there should be further employment land in the Borough and that it should be located at strategic urban extensions and at the science park?	4	29	3	36
Question 4.14 Do you agree that development at the Science Park should be restricted to research and development firms that complement the university's activities or other research and development firms in Loughborough?	6	9	5	20
Question 4.15 Do you think the Council should consider alternative types of employment on the science park if a large single employer was interested in locating there?	6	4	6	16
Question 4.16 Do you think we should seek to replace all the employment land lost since 2001 in addition to replacing the poor quality sites that are left in the Borough?	7	6	8	21
Question 4.17 Any Other Comments?	16	2	2	20

## Loughborough University

Question 4.18 Do you agree with the approach to student housing in Loughborough?	9	6	9	24
Question 4.19 Any Other Comments?	5		1	6

## Transport

Question 4.20 Do you agree with our approach to transport?	12	17	10	5	44
Question 4.21 Any Other Comments?	23	1	2	26	

## Green Infrastructure

Question 4.22 Have we identified the most important features of green infrastructure within the borough?	15	6	8	29
Question 4.23 Do you agree that dealing with all the green infrastructure assets in a single approach is the most appropriate way of achieving a net improvement?	10	7	2	19
Question 4.24	21	6	3	30

Any Other Comments?

**Regeneration**

Question 4.25 8 9 3 377 397  
Do you agree with our approach to Regeneration?

Question 4.26 7 1 8  
Are there any other general regeneration priorities that we should be considering?

Question 4.27 2 6 8  
Do you support the idea of Area Action Plans for Shepshed and Thurmaston?

Question 4.28 11 2 2 15  
Any Other Comments?

**Delivering Well Designed, High Quality Developments**

Question 4.29 5 18 2 25  
Do you agree with our approach to Design?

Question 4.30 9 9  
Any Other Comments?

**Affordable Housing**

Question 4.31 13 5 8 26  
Do you agree that we should consider increasing the proportion of affordable homes we require on new housing sites from 30%?

Question 4.32 3 4 3 10  
Do you agree that we should consider lowering the threshold for sites that qualify for providing affordable homes?

Question 4.33 11 2 2 15  
Any Other Comments?

**Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

Question 4.34 2 6 16 377 401  
Do you agree with our approach to meeting the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople?

Question 4.35 3 3  
Any Other Comments?

**Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation**

Question 4.36 8 13 1 22  
Do you agree with our approach to large-scale renewable energy?

Question 4.37 10 9 3 22  
Do you agree that sustainable urban extensions should be zero-carbon in advance of the Building Regulations?

Question 4.38 15 1 16  
Any Other Comments?

**Retail and Town Centres**

Question 4.39 7 7 1 15  
Do you agree with our overall approach to retail and town centres?

Question 4.40 2 7 9  
Do you agree with our approach of focussing new retail floor space towards Loughborough Town Centre?

Question 4.41 6 1 4 11  
Any Other Comments?

## Infrastructure Provision

Question 4.42 Do you agree with the list of things developers should contribute towards?	15	10	5	30
Question 4.43 Any Other Comments?	10	1	1	12

## Chapter 5: Implications of the Development Strategy for North and South Charnwood

### Introduction

Question 5.1 Do you agree with the boundaries drawn for each sub areas?	4	9	5	18
Question 5.2 Which sub area do you live in and what do you think are the key issues and opportunities?	8			8
Question 5.3 Any other comments?	2			2

### South Charnwood

Question 5.4 Do you have any comments on the proposals for South Charnwood?	12	2	3	17
--	----	---	---	----

### Sustainable Urban Extension to Leicester

Question 5.5 Is there anything else that we should consider in planning for this sustainable urban extension?	13		26	39
Question 5.6 Any other comments?		1	1	2

### North Charnwood

Question 5.7 Do you have any comments on the proposals for North Charnwood?	11	6	8	25
--	----	---	---	----

### Sustainable Urban Extension to Loughborough

Question 5.8 Is there anything else that we should consider in planning for this sustainable urban extension?	8	2	2	12
Question 5.9 Any other comments?	3		3	6

## Appendices

<b>Appendix A: Alternative Options for Directions for Growth to the Principal Urban Area of Leicester</b>	1			1
Alternative Option A: East of Thurmaston/North of Hamilton	4	2	5	11
Alternative Option B: East of Thurmaston/South of Syston	2	1	2	5
Alternative Option C: East of Thurmaston/South of Syston/North of Hamilton		2	1	3
Alternative Option D: North of Birstall	1	3	3	7
Alternative Option E: North of Glenfield/South of Anstey	2	3	4	9
<b>Appendix A: Alternative Options for Directions for Growth to the Sub-Regional Centre of Loughborough/Shepshed</b>				
Alternative Option A: South of Loughborough	2	3	5	10
Alternative Option B: South West of Loughborough	2	2	413	417
Alternative Option C: West of Loughborough	1	6	2	9
Alternative Option D: West of Shepshed	1	2	2	5

Alternative Option E: East of Loughborough		26	10	36
Alternative Option F: East of Loughborough, on and around Wymeswold Airfield	2	43	10	55
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>1180</b>
		<b>1786</b>	<b>3609</b>	

Total Number of Comments	3609
Total Number of Proforma Letters	596
Total Number of Respondents (including Proforma Respondents)	1535